

**AMENDMENTS TO THE DRAWINGS**

The attached sheet of drawing includes changes to Fig 6B. This sheet, which includes Fig. 6B, replaces the original sheet including Fig. 6B. The following changes have been made to Fig. 6B.

Attachment:        Replacement sheet  
                         Annotated sheet showing changes

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated August 26, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

The Specification has been amended to correct minor informalities. Claims 1, 4, 6, 7, 13, 15, 17, 20, 29, 31, 32, 37, 40, 41 and 45 are hereby amended. Claims 11-12, 14, 16, 18, 21-23, 25-28, 30, 33-36, 38, 39, 42-44 and 46-88 are hereby canceled without prejudice to or disclaimer of the contents contained therein. No claims are added. Accordingly, claims 1-10, 13, 15, 17, 19-20, 24, 29, 31-32, 37, 40, 41 and 45 are currently pending. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

**In the Office Action claims 4, 11, 20, 35 and 48 are objected to for informalities noted therein.** *Office Action* at pp. 2-3. The objection of claims 11, 35 and 48 is moot as claims 11, 35 and 48 are canceled herein. Applicants have corrected the remaining claim accordingly and request that the Office withdraw the objection.

**Claims 46-51 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action.** *Office Action* at p. 3, ¶ 10. The rejection of claims 46-51 is moot as claims 46-51 are canceled herein.

**Claims 77-87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action.** *Office Action* at p. 4, ¶ 11. The rejection of claims 77-87 is moot as claims 77-87 are canceled herein.

**Claims 78-88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly claim the subject matter which the Applicants regard as the invention, as discussed in the Office Action.** *Office Action* at p. 5. The rejection of claims 78-88 is moot as claims 78-88 are canceled herein.

**Claims 1-5, 8-14, 17-30, 32-39, 40-43, 46-49, 52, 55-59, 62-63, 65, 68-72, 75, 77, 80-84, 87 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No.**

**7,430,591 to Chamberlain (hereinafter “Chamberlain”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,111,100 to Ellerbrock (hereinafter “Ellerbrock”).** *Office Action* at p. 5, ¶ 13. The rejection of claims 14, 18, 21-23, 25-28, 30, 33-36, 38, 39, 42-44, 46-49, 52, 55-59, 62-63, 65, 68-72, 75, 77, 80-84, 87 as claims 14, 18, 21-23, 25-28, 30, 33-36, 38, 39, 42-44, 46-49, 52, 55-59, 62-63, 65, 68-72, 75, 77, 80-84, 87 are canceled herein. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims and request reconsideration.

Independent claims 1, 17, 32 and 40 are allowable over *Chamberlain* in view of *Ellerbrock* in that claims 1, 17, 32 and 40 similarly recite a combination of elements including, for example,

when the master device receives a plurality of plugged-in request messages within a predetermined time, the master device decides whether the plugged-in request messages are inputted from the same kind of product devices before setting the logical address, transmits join request messages containing temporary logical address ranges to the same kind of new devices when there are the messages inputted from the same kind of product devices, or transmits the join request messages containing the temporary logical address ranges respectively to the new product devices when there is no message inputted from same kind of product devices, wherein the new device sets an arbitrary value as a temporary logical address within the temporary logical address range, changes the logical address to the temporary logical address, and transmits a join ACK response message containing the temporary logical address to the master device, wherein the master device decides whether the temporary logical addresses contained in the join ACK response messages are identical, re-transmits join request messages containing new temporary logical address ranges to the new devices transmitting the same temporary logical addresses, and transmits address change request messages containing new logical addresses to the other new devices.

As admitted by the Office, “*Chamberlain* [is] silent to disclosing at least one new device newly connected to a master device through a network, for transmitting a plugged-in request message containing an initial address through the network, receiving an address change, request message containing a logical address, and changing the initial address to the logical address.” *Office*

*Action* at p. 6. Thus, *Chamberlain* does not teach or suggest, at least, these features of independent claim 1.

*Ellerbrock* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chamberlain*. The Office asserts that “*Ellerbrock* ...disclose at least one new device newly connected to a master device (bus controller) through a network.” *Office Action* at p. 6. *Ellerbrock* discloses that the newly added network device transmits the UUID code and common null address and the bus controller assigns a unique logical address to the newly added network device. *See Ellerbrock* at col. 8:45 - 9:20.. *Ellerbrock* discloses that “[t]he bus controller ... can then assign a unique logical address to each of the new network devices replacing the common null address.” *Ellerbrock* at col. 9:64-65. *Ellerbrock* also discloses that “the bus controller ... may segment the possible logical addresses to be assigned to the network devices into separate ranges based on the type of network devices.” *Ellerbrock* at col. 4:24-28. That is, in cases where only one new network device has been added, the bus controller in *Ellerbrock* can assign the next logical address to the new network device. Therefore, the bus controller in *Ellerbrock* cannot assign unique logical addresses to same kind of new network devices in case where a plurality of new devices are connected to the network. , transmits join request messages containing temporary logical address ranges to the same kind of new devices when there are the messages inputted from the same kind of product devices Accordingly, none of the cited references, singly or in combination, teaches or suggests

when the master device receives a plurality of plugged-in request messages within a predetermined time, the master device decides whether the plugged-in request messages are inputted from the same kind of product devices before setting the logical address, transmits join request messages containing temporary logical address ranges to the same kind of new devices when there are the messages inputted from the same kind of product devices, or transmits the join request messages containing the temporary logical address ranges respectively to the new product devices when there is no message inputted from same kind of product devices, wherein the new device sets an arbitrary value as a temporary logical address within the temporary logical address range, changes the logical address to the temporary logical address, and transmits a join ACK response message containing the temporary logical address to the master device, wherein the master device decides whether the temporary logical addresses contained in the join

ACK response messages are identical, re-transmits join request messages containing new temporary logical address ranges to the new devices transmitting the same temporary logical addresses, and transmits address change request messages containing new logical addresses to the other new devices, as recited in independent claim 1.

For at least these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the Office withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of independent claims 1, 17, 32 and 40. Claims 2-5, 8-10 and 13 depend from independent claim 1, claims 19, 20, 24, 29 and 31 depend from independent claim 17, claim 37 depends from independent claim 32 and claims 41 and 45 depend from independent claim 40. It stands to reason that the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of those dependent claims should be withdrawn as well.

**Claims 6-7, 16, 22-23, 53-54, 64, 66-67, 76, 78-79 and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Chamberlain* and *Ellerbrock* in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,308, 644 to Humpleman et al. (hereinafter “*Humpleman*”).** *Office Action* at p. 37, ¶ 14. The rejection of claims 53-54, 64, 66-67, 76, 78-79 and 88 is moot as claims -54, 64, 66-67, 76, 78-79 and 88 are canceled herein. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection of the remaining claims and request reconsideration.

*Humpleman* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Chamberlain* and *Ellerbrock* with respect to independent claims 1, 17 and 32. Indeed, the Office only relied upon *Humpleman* to purportedly disclose “the master device updates a home network list by registering the new device.” *Office Action* at p. 38. Because none of the cited references, either individually or in combination, teaches or suggests each and every element of independent claims 1, 17 and 32, they also fail to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 6-7, 16, which depend from claim 1 and claims 22-23, which depend from claim 17. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request the Office to withdraw the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejection of claims 6-7, 16, 22-23.

**CONCLUSION**

The application is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully solicited.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: November 27, 2009

Respectfully submitted,

By

  
**Michael I. Angert**

Registration No.: 46,522

McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP

1900 K Street, N.W.

Washington, DC 20006

(202) 496-7500

Attorneys for Applicant

Attachments